

Remarks & Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 25-27 are pending in the application, and that Claims 25-27 are rejected. By this amendment, Claims 28-40 have been added. Thus, Claims 25-40 are pending in the application. The new claims do not add new matter to the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 4,900,501 to Saeki and U.S. Patent No. 6,913,950 to Kobayakawa. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 25-27 on the basis that the relied upon references do not teach every element in the independent Claim 25.

Claim 25, recites "causing a molding material to flow into a first cavity," "causing said molding material to flow from said first cavity into a second cavity adjacent to and in the same column as said first cavity," and "causing said molding material to flow from said first cavity into a third cavity adjacent to and in the same row as said first cavity." The Office refers to Saeki at col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 8, col. 3, lines 10-60; col. 2, lines 55-68, to support the assertion that Saeki teaches an apparatus that comprises "a transfer mold having a plurality of cavities fed by runners formed through consecutive cavities. The apparatus allows flow of resin from the first cavity, to the second cavity, to the next consecutive cavities until all are filled with resin molding material. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's position, and

suggest that the relied upon passages do teach or suggest the limitations that the Office alleges that they do. In particular, Saeki teaches a transfer mold including a plurality of cavities arranged in a matrix of columns and rows (Figures 1, 3, 4 and 5). Saeki also specifically teaches that three cavities are serially disposed at the end of each runner and that each runner is independent of the other runners (co. 3, lines 1-2 and 67-68; Figures 1, 3, 4 and 5). Accordingly, Saeki discloses that molding resin “serially” flows from a first cavity into a second cavity and from the second cavity into the third cavity. In contrast, Claim 25 recites that molding material flows from the first cavity into the second cavity and from the first cavity into the third cavity.

Kobayakawa is cited as discussing a technique for encapsulating leadless semiconductor packages, including generally providing a plurality of die pads on a mother substrate to which a plurality of device are attached. However, Kobayakawa does not disclose “causing a molding material to flow into a first cavity,” “causing said molding material to flow from said first cavity into a second cavity adjacent to and in the same column as said first cavity,” and “causing said molding material to flow from said first cavity into a third cavity adjacent to and in the same row as said first cavity.” Thus, Kobayakawa does not add anything to the teachings of Saeki with reference to Claim 25.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 25 is patentable over Saeki in view of Kobayakawa. Accordingly, Applicants request that the obviousness rejection of Claim 25 be withdrawn and that Claim 25 be allowed.

Claims 26 and 27 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on respective base Claim 25, as well as the additional elements they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of Claims 26 and 27 be withdrawn and that Claims 26 and 27 be allowed.

With regard to new independent **Claim 28**, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Saeki nor Kobayakawa teach or suggest that “the cavities are arranged in a matrix having a plurality of columns of cavities and a plurality of rows of cavities,” “injecting a molding material along each of the plurality of columns of cavities,” and “causing the molding material to flow along each of the plurality of rows of cavities.” Instead, Saie specifically teaches that three cavities are serially disposed at the end of each runner and that each runner and that each runner is independent of the other runners. Those skilled in the art appreciate that if the cavities are serially disposed at the end of each runner and that each runner is independent from other runners, that Saie necessarily excludes “injecting a molding material along each of the plurality of columns of cavities,” and “causing the molding material to flow along each of the plurality of rows of cavities.”

Similarly, with regard to new independent Claim 35, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Saeki nor Kobayakawa teach or suggest “injecting a molding material into a first cavity, from the first cavity through a first gate into a second cavity and from the second cavity through a second gate into a third cavity, wherein first gate and second gate are situated along a first column containing the first cavity, the second cavity and the third cavity,” “injecting the molding material into a fourth cavity, from the fourth cavity through a third gate into a fifth cavity and

from the fifth cavity through a fourth gate into a sixth cavity, wherein the third gate and fourth gate are situated along a second column containing the fourth cavity, the fifth cavity and the sixth cavity,” “causing the molding material to flow from the second cavity through a fifth gate into the fifth cavity, wherein the fifth gate is situated along a row containing the second cavity and fifth cavity.” Instead, Saiki necessarily excludes injecting molding material along columns and allowing the material to flow from cavities in one column to corresponding cavities in another column, if the cavities are serially disposed at the end of each runner and that each runner and that each runner is independent of the other runners.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 28-40 are patentable over Saeki in view of Kobayakawa.

Conclusion

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-0085. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to

Appl. No. 10/789,799
Amdt. Dated 6/12/06
Reply to Office Action of 3/10/06

charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time
to Deposit Account 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated:

6/12/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric J. Gash", written over a horizontal line.

Eric J. Gash
Registration No. 46,274
Tel.: (408) 938-9060